Gmail Krista Dandridge-Barnett <kristadandridgebarnett@gmail.com>

Edit: "Ways & Means Committee" | Fwd: Ways & Means Committe

1 message

Krista Dandridge-Barnett <kristadandridgebarnett@gmail.com> Fri, Mar 7, 2025 at 11:44 AM
Draft To: "info.clerkweb@mail.house.gov" <info.clerkweb@mail.house.gov>
Bcc: Krista Dandridge-Barnett <KristaDandridgeBarnett@gmail.com>, Richard.Neal@mail.house.gov, David.Schweikert@mail.house.gov, YVETTE.D.CLARKE@mail.house.gov, Yvette.Clarke@mail.house.gov, Mike.Carey@mail.house.gov, Jason.Smith@mail.house.gov

EDIT

House.gov
c/o: Ways & Means Committee

Friday | March 07, 2025 | 2:44PM EST

Greetings!... Having had the opportunity to speak with an Operator at 202.225.2015 on Friday, March 07, 2025 at 1:27 (call lasting 11 minutes and 9 seconds), it was then I shared varied concerns with respect to *Corporate & Commoner Welfare*. It would seem appropriate for the United States to begin addressing the abuse and fraud, systematically perpetrated by Corporate interests, whereas to propagate and restrict those not fitting within either *classifications, exclusively, at/to the bottom--in a disadvantage or mooching state. Examples of those would be California--that of which I refer to as the "Mommy state"--a state that apparently finds no injustice with systematically benefitting, or "blessing" as it were, the "Mothers" (or "Fathers") of adolescents, at the expense of others who, primarily, fit not within the qualifications of either: *Parenthood, *Corporatehood*, or Commoner *Welfarehood.* It's **more** than just a problem that has yet to be addressed!

So, sometime ago, I emailed HUD with to respect to Section 8, alleging that the only ones benefiting from the scheme are those of a certain income qualification, whether it be below or over, fitting within the "guidelines" of Corporatism and *Commonerism*. Furthermore, when comparing both "Corporate" and "Commoner", the winner is, of course, "Corporate". Without HUD, property values would propel downward towards depreciative value, and not that of appreciate value. So, while Republicans might outwardly speak against Corporate Welfare, their actions would attest to otherwise, as if HUD weren't in place, their "assets" would fall into a state of depravity--and this is something, I'm afraid, some would **not** dare to publicly agree with. Conversely, while Democrats might outwardly speak against Corporate Welfare, they, by default, have enabled and are still enabling the system, whereas, by default, those not fitting in either of such categories, "Corporate" or "Commoner", stay cemented to the bottom. It's all as though it's a manipulative scheme sustained by both parties: Democrats & Republicans. A joke? Indeed.

Although I don't vote, I still felt compelled to share my concerns.

*As long as certain qualifications, hidden or otherwise, are met

Your consideration is appreciated & Thanks!...

`~*Respectfully,*

Krista Dandridge-Barnett

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Krista Dandridge-Barnett** <kristadandridgebarnett@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Mar 7, 2025 at 11:32 AM
Subject: Ways & Means Committe
To: <info.clerkweb@mail.house.gov>
Cc: <Mike.Carey@mail.house.gov>, Krista Dandridge-Barnett <KristaDandridgeBarnett@gmail.com>

House.gov

Friday | March 07, 2025 | 2:32PM EST

Greetings!... Having had the opportunity to speak with an Operator at 202.225.2015 on Friday, March 07, 2025 at 1:27 (call lasting 11 minutes and 9 seconds), it was then I shared varied concerns with respect to *Corporate & Commoner Welfare*. It would seem appropriate for the United States to begin addressing the abuse and fraud, systematically perpetrated by Corporate interests, whereas to propagate and restrict those not fitting within either *classifications, exclusively, at/to the bottom--in a disadvantage or mooching state. Examples of those would be California--that of which I refer to as the "Mommy state"--a state that apparently finds no injustice with systematically benefitting, or "blessing" as it were, the "Mothers" (or "Fathers") of adolescents, at the expense of others who, primarily, fit not within the qualifications of either: *Parenthood, *Corporatehood*, or Commoner *Welfarehood.* It's **more** than just a problem that has yet to be addressed!

So, sometime ago, I emailed HUD with to respect to Section 8, alleging that the only ones benefiting from the scheme are those of a certain income qualification, whether it be below or over, fitting within the "guidelines" of Corporatism and *Commonerism*. Furthermore, when comparing both "Corporate" and "Commoner", the winner is, of course, "Corporate". Without HUD, property values would propel downward towards depreciative value, and not that of appreciate value. So, while Republicans might outwardly speak against Corporate Welfare, their actions would attest to otherwise, as if HUD weren't in place, their "assets" would fall into a state of depravity--and this is something, I'm afraid, some would **not** dare to publicly agree with. Conversely, while Democrats might outwardly speak against Corporate Welfare, they, by default, have enabled and are still enabling the system, whereas, by default, those not fitting in either of such categories, "Corporate" or "Commoner", stay cemented to the bottom. It's all as though it's a manipulative scheme sustained by both parties: Democrats & Republicans. A joke? Indeed.

Although I don't vote, I still felt compelled to share my concerns.

*As long as certain qualifications, hidden or otherwise, are met

Your consideration is appreciated & Thanks!...

'`~*Respectfully,*

Krista Dandridge-Barnett

'`~CONFIDENTIAL DISCLOSURE

This email and all contained herein and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the System Manager. This message [email and/or attachments] contain[s] CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute, or copy this email. Please notify the sender immediately by email if you have received the email by mistake and delete this email from your system Immediately. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. If you are the intended recipient you are hereby notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any part of this email and/or any attachments to disclose, copy, distribute to a person or entity in which this email was and/or is not specifically addressed to is strictly prohibited. If the named addressee would like to distribute this email and/or any attachments within the particular email, the named addressee **must** receive proper and acceptable permission from/by Ms. Krista Dandridge-Barnett.

It should be and is clear that if Ms. Krista Dandridge-Barnett should contact and/or be contacted by any named addressee via the phone, any conversation between Ms. Krista Dandridge-Barnett and/or the individual[s] and/or entity[ies] must remain confidential and is **not** to be recorded **[n]or** speaker-phoned **[n]or** broadcast[ed] **[n]or** third-party “listen in” [**[n]or** multi-party “listen in”] at any time.

Any email[s] [and/or attachment[s]] following the original and/or subsequent email from KristaDandridgeBarnett@gmail.com is confidential whether or not the **CONFIDENTIAL DISCLOSURE** is immediate following the communication and/or response[s] from Ms. Krista Dandridge-Barnett. No part of this email and/or attachment may be reproduced, distributed, translated, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or storing in any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of Ms. Krista Dandridge-Barnett.

THIS EMAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENT[S] IS/ARE CONFIDENTIAL.